A U M

He who dwells in all beings, and within all beings, whom all beings do not know, whose body all beings are, and who rules all beings within, he is thy Self, the ruler within, the Immortal. —BRIHADARANYAKA UPANISHAD.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX December, 1941 No. 2

CHRISTMAS

CHRISTMAS is the one festival season observed the world around by, and despite, sect and creed and race and condition. It is the one time when a rare influence steals over all men and women and children and stirs the impulse to give. Here is a unity binding all hearts back to their primeval nature, as it was in the childhood and the godhood of the race. Some may give wisely and with love, others in terms of reciprocity, still others, foolishly or grudgingly; yet, something deeper impels the giving more than they know or show.

Christmas is the mark of the Sun's turning on his northward course through the heavens, in the northern hemisphere; in the southern, only a few lost tribes mark still the festival of their returning Sun to the south, on June the twenty-first, to bring their land blessing of his energy and fructification. Still to them is the Sun the Great Giver of Life and Light spiritual.

North or South, it is in some Sun hour that a touch of spiritual Sun enters the heart of one who longs to give, as Sun does, demanding no return. And from that hour, the roots of that being begin to burgeon in another world. Not without struggle with all the elements of life does he come at last into full spiritual Light, in the Company of Holy Ones, who have ever, in dark seasons, by Their own light, descended into Hell to rouse from winter torpor, to help and teach those younger, suffering there. Such Holy Ones we know as Christs and Buddhas.

Wherever may these Great Ones be, Their influence moves within those hearts open with thought of others. Hence comes the radiance and joy of Christmas time. However desolate the earth, however filled with cruelties and selfishness is the world, there is still in the heart of every human being a Christ-to-be, a Buddha yet to come. The Spiritual Sun is his origin, his destiny: from it he came and to it must return, bound back to the Source by will to give to all, and take from none.

JESUS: PHILOSOPHER AND REFORMER

[Roused from their complacency by karmic impacts of planetary proportion, the more thoughtful of western mankind are showing signs of a new awakening. Many of these are turning to the neglected past and a faith all but forgotten, in the hope that somewhere, somehow, may be found the firm foundation for a better, wiser order of society, to be built, it may be, even amid the ruins of the old. It happens, therefore, that today, and with increasing frequency, Theosophical students are asked for an account of the place and part of Jesus in their philosophy. The ethically impoverished West knows no other figure to revere. Was he man or God? Savior, or bloodless myth? To meet these current questions, a number of extracts from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge have been collected and joined to form a compact and unambiguous statement of the answer Theosophy provides. The sources of the extracts, in the order presented, are as follows: *Isis Unveiled* II, 37-8, 337, 531, 150-1, 149, 192-3, 574; THEOSOPHY IV, 137, 138, 36 fn.; *Isis* II, 337, 530; *Path* III, 252-3; THEOSOPHY IV, 73, I, 460.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

EVERYONE knows," wrote the great Manichean of the third century, Fauste, "that the Evangeliums were written neither by Jesus Christ, nor his apostles, but long after their time by some unknown persons, who, judging well that they would hardly be believed when telling of things they had not seen themselves, headed their narratives with the names of the apostles or of disciples contemporaneous with the latter."

It is a poor compliment paid the Supreme, this forcing upon him four gospels, in which, contradictory as they often are, there is not a single narrative, sentence, or peculiar expression, whose parallel may not be found in some older doctrine or philosophy. Surely, the Almighty—were it but to spare future generations their present perplexity—might have brought down with Him, at His *first and only* incarnation on earth, something original—something that would trace a distinct line of demarcation between Himself and the score or so of incarnate Pagan gods, who had been born of virgins, had all been saviours, and were either killed, or otherwise sacrificed themselves for humanity. The "heathen" find nothing in the teachings of Jesus—sublime though some are—that Christna and Gautama had not taught them before. Except a handful of self-styled Christians who subsequently won the day, all the civilized portion of the Pagans who knew of Jesus honored him as a philosopher, an *adept* whom

they placed on the same level with Pythagoras and Apollonius. Whence such a veneration on their part for a man, were he simply, as represented by the Synoptics, a poor, unknown Jewish carpenter from Nazareth? As an incarnated God there is no single record of him on this earth capable of withstanding the critical examination of science; as one of the greatest reformers, an inveterate enemy of every theological dogmatism, a persecutor of bigotry, a teacher of one of the most sublime codes of ethics, Jesus is one of the grandest and most clearly-defined figures on the panorama of human history. His age may, with every day, be receding farther and farther back into the gloomy and hazy mists of the past; and his theology—based on human fancy and supported by untenable dogmas may, nay, must with every day lose more of its unmerited prestige; alone the grand figure of the philosopher and moral reformer instead of growing paler will become with every century more pronounced and more clearly defined. It will reign supreme and universal only on that day when the whole of humanity recognizes but one father—the UNKNOWN ONE above—and one brother—the whole of mankind below.

It is this absence of all proof, the lack of the least positive clew about him whom Christianity has deified, that has caused the present state of perplexity. It is a most suggestive fact that there is not a word in the so-called sacred *Scriptures* to show that Jesus was actually regarded as a God by his disciples. Neither before nor after his death did they pay him divine honors. Their relation to him was only that of disciples and "master"; by which name they addressed him, as the followers of Pythagoras and Plato addressed their respective masters before them.

Take Paul, read the little of original that is left of him in the writings attributed to this brave, honest, sincere man, and see whether any one can find a word therein to show that Paul meant by the word Christ anything more than the abstract ideal of the personal divinity indwelling in man. For Paul, Christ is not a person, but an embodied idea. Paul was the only one of the apostles who had understood the secret ideas underlying the teachings of Jesus, although he had never met him. As Professor A. Wilder well proves in a series of able articles, it *was not Jesus, but Paul who was the real founder of Christianity.*

Whence, then, the Gospels, the life of Jesus of Nazareth? Has it not been repeatedly stated that no human, *mortal* brain could have invented the life of the Jewish Reformer, followed by the awful drama on Calvary? We say, on the authority of the esoteric Eastern School, that all this came from the Gnostics, as far as the name

Christos and the astronomico-mystical allegories are concerned, and from the writings of the ancient *Tanaïm* as regards the Kabalistic connection of Jesus or Joshua, with the Biblical personifications.

The Gnostic Records contained the epitome of the chief scenes enacted during the mysteries of Initiation, since the memory of man; though even that was given not invariably under the garb of semi-allegory, whenever entrusted to parchment or paper. But the ancient Tanaïm, the Initiates from whom the wisdom of the Kabala (*oral tradition*) was obtained by the later Talmudists, had in their possession the secrets of the mystery language, and it is *in this language that the Gospels* were written. Thus while the three Synoptics display a combination of the pagan Greek and Jewish symbologies the *Revelation* is written in the mystery language of the Tanaïm—the relic of Egyptian and Chaldean wisdom—and St. John's Gospel is purely Gnostic. The Christian application of the compound name Jesus-Christ is all based on Gnostic and Eastern mysticism. The Christian canon, especially the *Gospels, Acts* and *Epistles,* are made up of fragments of gnostic wisdom, the ground-work of which is *pre-Christian* and built on the MYSTERIES of Initiation.

Too much has already been conceded to the emotional side of the story. What the world needs is a less exalted, but more faithful view of a personage, in whose favor nearly half of Christendom has dethroned the Almighty. If we do not accept Jesus as a God, we revere *him as a man.* Such a feeling honors him more than if we were to attribute to him the powers and personality of the Supreme, and credit him at the same time with having played a useless comedy with mankind, as, after all, his mission proves scarcely less than a complete failure.

As to the Karma of whoever Jesus was, that is another matter. [There is] a theory held by many occultists that a certain person did appear among men *at the wrong time;* one whose charity and zeal outran his judgment and overrode the injunctions of his superiors; one who gave out doctrines in themselves good, but inopportune; and he is now spoken of as "Jesus." A vast mass of Karma composed of all the wrong done in his name, and to which he would not be a party, were he here, is against his account; as Shakespeare puts it, "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." A comparison may be easily drawn by considering Buddha, who, teaching at the right time, has caused no wars and no such direct evil as has sprung in and out of the religion built up on the life of Jesus. The whole question is a very deep one, for it takes hold on points in the doctrine of Karma but slightly regarded by theosophists.

A great being, or adept, is affected by the inevitable law in ways that are unimaginable to those who do not know much about the doctrine; he is subject to effects that are as vast in their reach as his own powers are enormous, and when he deliberately violates, not only the laws of his order, but other laws, the result is far worse than when an ordinary mortal transgresses.

To the true follower of the SPIRIT OF TRUTH, it matters little whether Jesus, as man and Chrestos, lived during the era called Christian, or before, or never lived at all. The Adepts, who lived and died for humanity, have existed in many and all the ages, and many were the good and holy men in antiquity who bore the surname or title of Chrestos before Jesus of Nazareth, otherwise Jesus (or Jehoshua) Ben Pandira was born.

Tell the truth, but do not force it. If even a pious soul should lose the historical Jesus Christ and see instead the glorious image of the Self in every man, that were a gain worth all the pain the first rude shock might give. The danger of lifting the veil of Isis lies not in the doctrines of Unity, Reincarnation, and Karma, but in untaught mysteries which no Theosophist is able to reveal. The change from dogma or creed to a belief in law and justice impartial will bring perhaps some tears to the soul, but the end thereof is peace and freedom.

CHRESTOS AND CHRISTOS

The terms Christ and Christians, spelt originally *Chrést* and *Chréstians,* were borrowed from the Temple vocabulary of the Pagans. *Chréstos* meant, in that vocabulary, "a disciple on probation," a candidate for hierophantship; who, when he had attained it, through Initiation, long trials and suffering, and had been anointed (*i. e.,* "rubbed with oil," as Initiates and even Idols of the Gods were, as the last touch of ritualistic observance), was changed into *Christos* —the "purified" in esoteric or mystery language. In mystic symbology, indeed, Christes or Christos meant that the "way," the *Path,* was already trodden and the goal reached; when the fruits of the arduous labour, uniting the personality of evanescent clay with the indestructible INDIVIDUALITY, transformed it thereby into the immortal EGO. "At the end of the way stands the Christes," the Purifier; and the union once accomplished, the Chréstos, the "man of sorrow" became *Christos* himself.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

FIGURES OF THE TRANSITION AGE

The pendulum of thought oscillates between extremes. Having now finally emancipated herself from the shackles of theology, Science has embraced the opposite fallacy; and in the attempt to interpret Nature on purely materialistic lines, she has built up that most extravagant theory of the ages—the derivation of man from a ferocious and brutal ape. So rooted has this doctrine, in one form or another, now become, that the most Herculean efforts will be needed to bring about its final rejection. The Darwinian anthropology is the incubus of the ethnologist, a sturdy child of modern Materialism, which has grown up and acquired increasing vigour, as the ineptitude of the theological legend of Man's "creation" became more and more apparent. It has thriven on account of the strange delusion that—as a scientist of repute puts it—"All hypotheses and theories with respect to the rise of man can be reduced to *two* (the Evolutionist and the Biblical exoteric account). . . . There is no other hypothesis conceivable . . . "!!

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine,* 1888.

Man's opinion of himself in relation to the rest of the animals has swung pendulum-wise, between too great or too little a conceit of himself, fixing now too large a gap between himself and the animals, now too small. The gap, of course, can be diminished or increased at either the animal or the human end. One can, like Descartes, make animals too mechanical, or, like most unsophisticated people, humanize them too much. Or one can work at the human end of the gap, and either dehumanize one's own kind into an animal species like any other, or superhumanize it into beings a little lower than the angels.

—JULIAN HUXLEY, *Man Stands Alone,* 1941.

MUCH of the Theosophic literature is given over to the history of ideas, religious, scientific, and philosophical, that have prevailed in the succeeding epochs of civilization, not because there is some extraordinary intrinsic value in historical knowledge, but because when men have gained some insight into the laws which govern intellectual and moral development, they are in a position to evaluate the dominant conceptions of their own time. This insight becomes of particular importance during a cycle of transition such as the present, "when every system of thought, science, religion, government, and society is changing." In fact, as innumerable statements and articles by H. P. Blavatsky make clear, the Theosophical Movement was launched in the last century in order that the swing of the pendulum of thought toward materialism might be arrested, and the foundations laid for the future moral order of society. The

critical nature of that period is indicated in a passage from *The Key to Theosophy:* "Had the formation of the Theosophical Society been postponed a few years longer, one half of the civilized nations would have become by this time [1889] rank materialists, and the other half anthropomorphists and phenomenalists." What may be the fruit of the Theosophical attempt to clarify the origins of modern materialism and to point to the possibility of a philosophy of life, at once scientific and religious, H. P. B. described in a closing paragraph of her article, "Is Theosophy A Religion?":

> If theosophy does no more than point out and seriously draw the attention of the world to the fact that the *supposed* disagreement between religion and science is conditioned, on the one hand by the intelligent materialists rightly kicking against absurd human dogmas, and on the other by blind fanatics and interested churchmen who, instead of defending the souls of mankind, fight simply tooth and nail for their personal bread and butter and authority—why, even then, theosophy will prove itself the saviour of mankind.

The materialism of the nineteenth century was no "tentative" movement, modestly feeling its way. The endeavor to explain all happenings, cosmic, earthly, and human, in naturalistic terms, had begun in European thought one hundred years before, with the deliberate materialism of Lamettrie. He hoped, by exalting the powers of Nature, to make belief in a personal God unnecessary. The world, he maintained, "would never be happy unless it was atheistic." The reasons offered in support of this contention are of profound importance for the understanding of the moral fervor which undoubtedly animated many of the great materialists of the past. Lamettrie made his spokesman argue:

> If Atheism were universally disseminated, all the branches of religion would be torn up by the roots. Then there would be no more theological wars: there would be no more soldiers of religion, that terrible kind of soldier. Nature, which had been infected by the consecrated poison, would win back her rights and her purity. Deaf to all other voices, men would follow their own individual impulses, and these impulses alone can lead them to happiness along the pleasant path of virtue.[1]

This passage occurs in *Man a Machine,* published in 1748, the year before Rousseau was to write his famous *Discourse on Arts and Sciences,* urging the destruction of the prevailing social institutions and a return to the idyllic "state of Nature." The current of humanitarianism is evident in the works of both these eighteenth century reformers, one, the prophet of Atheism, the other, of Revolution. In

[1] Quoted by F. H. Lange, *History of Materialism* II, 72.

1770 a work that has been called the "Bible of Materialism" appeared—*The System of Nature,* by Dietrich von Holbach. This German baron gave systematic form to the doctrines of materialism. Man's unhappiness, Holbach announces in his preface, is due to his misunderstanding of Nature. The author's motive, the same as Lamettrie's, is unfolded in a denunciation of the deceptions of priests and the oppressions of kings:

> Man disdained the study of nature to pursue after phantoms, that, like will-o'-the-wisps, dazzled him and drew him from the plain path of truth, away from which he cannot attain happiness. It is therefore time to seek in nature remedies against the evils into which fanaticism has plunged us. There is but one truth, and it can never harm us. To error are due the grievous fetters by which tyrants and priests everywhere succeed in chaining the nations; from error arose the bondage to which the nations are subject; from error the terrors of religion, which brought about that men mouldered in fear, or fanatically throttled each other for chimeras. From error arose deep-rooted hatred and cruel persecutions; the continual bloodshed and the horrid tragedies of which earth must be made the theatre to serve the interests of heaven.[2]

Holbach proceeds to a determined attack on all possible ideas of God, devoting fourteen chapters to this task. For him, religion is the chief source of human corruption. Soul is but the brain in operation, and all moral and intellectual faculties are derived by Holbach from our sensibility to impressions of the external world. Yet in spite of this uncompromising materialism, the ethical quality of his writings caused one of the Theosophical Adepts to say in a letter to A. P. Sinnett: "Strangely enough I found a European author—the greatest materialist of his time, Baron d'Holbach,—whose views coincide entirely with the views of our philosophy. When reading his *Essais sur la Nature,* I might have imagined I had our book of Kiu-ti before me."

The lesson to be gained from a study of eighteenth century philosophers is that social conditions determine the drift of speculative thought and the interpretations of science. Earnest men decide that changes must come about, and then seek for reasons to justify those changes. Rousseau condemned the existing structure of society as parent of all evil, declaring that a revolution was necessary to separate the original, "naturally good" man from the circumstances which had made him evil. The French Revolution was an application of this belief. The more ardent of the reformers were unwilling to rest upon the hope that the spread of Atheism would in time obliterate

[2] *Ibid.* II, 97.

the crimes of social injustice. They sought and found a plan of immediate action in the writings of Rousseau. "The atheist," said Madame Roland, "is seeking for a syllogism, while I am offering up my thanksgiving." She had, as Carl Becker puts it, "renounced the harsh creed of Catholicism only to be chilled by the cold and barren rationalism of the very philosophers whose works had pointed to intellectual emancipation."[3] The claim of Hobbes and Helvetius that primitive man was a selfish beast, restrained only by the laws of the state, was not accepted by the revolutionists. Such a theory gave no foundation for reform. "Helvetius," Madame Roland wrote, "destroyed the most ravishing illusions, and showed me everywhere a mean and revolting self-interest. I persuaded myself that he delineated mankind in the state to which it had been reduced by the corruption of society." This was the "anthropology" behind the French Revolution, the teaching of "science" supported and interpreted by "reason."

The syllogisms of the Atheists were particularly uninspiring when compared with the passionate words of Rousseau. "Man is born free, but is everywhere in chains." "Naturally good, it is society which corrupts him." So affirmed the *Social Contract,* beginning the enchantment wrought by "the siren voice of the man whose overtopping egotism enabled him to credit himself with virtues which he regarded as natural, while charging his neighbors with vices which he felt had been thrust upon him by an artificial society." Led on by the promises of a golden age that would follow, France rushed into the maw of revolution, only to awake from that nightmare of bloodshed and revenge in the iron embrace of Napoleon Bonaparte.

The early years of the nineteenth century saw a pause in the development of materialistic belief. In Germany, the period of Idealism and Nature Philosophy was in full flower, transmitting its influence to England through Carlyle and Coleridge, and to America through the Transcendentalists. A temporary union between science and religion was attained in the various pantheistic doctrines which were becoming widely popular. This was the period of Goethe, of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, of Pestalozzi and Froebel. In 1810 the naturalist, Oken, a disciple of Schelling, set forth the ancient doctrine of Emanation as expressing the religion that a scientist could adopt:

> The philosophy of Nature is the science of the eternal transformation of God into the world. It has the task of showing the world's evolution from the primal nothingness; how the heavenly bodies and the elements arose, how these advanced to higher forms, how finally

---

[3] *Every Man his own Historian* (New York, 1935), p. 283.

> organisms appeared and in man attained to reason. These phases constitute the history of the generation of the universe. . . . The philosophy of nature is in the most comprehensive sense cosmogony, or, as Moses called it, *Genesis*.[4]

In England, Carlyle reflects the same sublime quality of thought, repeating Novalis in his famous essay on *Hero Worship* (1840): "There is but one temple in the universe, and that is the body of man. Nothing is holier than that high form. . . . We touch heaven when we lay our hand on a human body!" Carlyle adds, "This sounds like mere flourish of rhetoric, but it is not so. If well meditated it will turn out to be a scientific fact; the expression . . . of the actual truth of the thing. We are the miracle of miracles, — the great inscrutable Mystery." Wordsworth and Shelley gave similar voice to the spirit of the age.

Nowhere were the fruits of the new freedom more in evidence than in America. Emerson, Thoreau, and Alcott were nourished by the same springs of inspiration that later brought from O. B. Frothingham, an eloquent Unitarian, the declaration:

> Talk of Science as being irreligious, atheistic! Science is creating a new idea of God. It is due to science that we have any conception at all of a *living* God. If we do not become atheists one of these days under the maddening effect of Protestantism, it will be due to Science, because it is disabusing us of hideous illusions that tease and embarrass us, and putting us in the way of reasoning about the things we see . . . .

The progressive tendencies of the first half of the nineteenth century have many illustrations. In 1806 Napoleon established the University of France to superintend national education; in 1808 his invasion of Spain brought an end to the Inquisition and curtailment to the power of the clergy. In 1815 the Congress of Vienna abolished the slave trade. The Factory Bill limiting child labor was passed by the English Parliament in 1831, and the Reform Laws of 1832 gave impetus to the world-wide growth of trade unionism. In 1834 slavery was abolished in the British colonies, and throughout the period agitation against slavery was carried on in the United States, culminating in the great congressional debate of 1850. After years of unceasing labor, Horace Mann and Henry Barnard succeeded in eliminating sectarian religion from public education and laid the basis for the modern American educational system.

Directly or indirectly, these and many other constructive changes were made possible by the forces of reform that had originated in the eighteenth century. Most important of all was the freedom of

---

[4] Quoted by A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, p. 320.

mind for which men like Lamettrie, Holbach and Voltaire had struggled. After their iconoclastic work, the way was clear for the emergence of a positive philosophy of humanitarianism, uncontaminated by the "consecrated poison" abhorred by the French materialists. The Atheists had called Nature to the stand to convict Jehovah of non-existence, and while the idealists of the early nineteenth century accepted the evidence of Nature, instead of turning materialists, they adopted the religion of Pantheism. Political philosophers took the humanitarian principles of the Revolution as settled realities and proceeded to expand their meaning and application. The social doctrines of Joseph Mazzini show a remarkable synthesis of all that was constructive in the great changes worked in the human mind and human society by the eighteenth century reformers.

But Materialism was far from "dead." In 1848, the year of abortive revolutions, Marx and Engels proclaimed the social doctrine of materialism in the *Communist Manifesto*. During the next decade, Moleschott, Vogt and Büchner published essays and books which became the foundation for the scientific materialism of later years. August Comte's *Politique Positive* appeared between 1851 and 1854. Feuerbach began the "Materialist Controversy" in 1854 by giving the Hegelian system a materialistic interpretation at the Convention of Natural Scientists at Göttingen. Then, as the climax of a decade of enthusiastic attacks on all idealistic beliefs in the soul, immortality, and a spiritual view of nature, Charles Darwin in 1859 published his *Origin of Species*.

On the same day that Darwin's great work appeared, Nov. 24, 1859, he wrote to Thomas Huxley, saying, "I have heard from Murray [his publisher] today that he sold the whole edition of my book the first day, and he wants another instantly." While *Origin of Species* was uniformly assailed by the clergy and all branches of orthodox opinion, and at first gained the support of very few scientists, the book was studied, discussed and attacked with such vehemence that its general contentions were soon well known throughout the western world. During the 1860's, as the force of Darwin's arguments began to be recognized, the issue between science and religion lost its generalized character as a cosmological problem and moved into the more definite realm of Anthropology, where it has remained ever since. The subsequent popularity of Darwinism among scientists, the losing battle of words fought by Christian apologists, ending in a victory of Evolution, show the direction in which the "pendulum of thought" began to swing at the midpoint of the nineteenth century.

The transition accomplished by the intellectual giants of Evolutionism, Darwin, Huxley, and the rest, is described in the opening pages of an essay by Julian S. Huxley, eminent zoologist of the present day, and grandson of Darwin's most famous contemporary and champion. Mr. Huxley begins with some general observations on man's changing ideas of his own nature, then characterizing the developments of the nineteenth century. Before the rise of modern science, he recounts,

> Man saw himself as being set apart, with the rest of the animal kingdom created to serve his needs and pleasure, with no share in salvation, no position in eternity. In Western civilization this swing of the pendulum reached its limit in developed Christian theology and in the philosophy of Descartes; both alike inserted a qualitative and unbridgeable barrier between all men and any animals.
>
> With Darwin, the reverse swing was started. Man was once again regarded as an animal, but now in the light of science, . . . At the outset, the consequences of the changed outlook were not fully explored. The unconscious prejudices and attitudes of an earlier age survived, disguising many of the moral and philosophical implications of the new outlook. But gradually the pendulum reached the furthest point of its swing. What seemed the logical consequences of Darwinian postulates were faced: man is an animal like any other; accordingly, his views as to the special meaning of human life and human ideals need merit no more consideration in the light of eternity (or of evolution) than those of a bacillus or a tapeworm. Survival is the only criterion of evolutionary success: therefore, all existing organisms are of equal value. The idea of progress is a mere anthropomorphism. Man happens to be the dominant type at the moment, but he might be replaced by the ant or the rat. And so on.

One of the laws of Psychology as taught by Theosophy is the necessity of man's exhausting the experiences of a plane, before it is possible for him to rise to a higher level. It was under this law that the logical consequences of Darwinian postulates were developed to the extreme animalism reached in the modern theories of Freudian psychoanalysis and Watsonian Behaviorism. The human qualities of man, which distinguish him from the animals, were almost entirely ignored by these schools of scientific opinion, until, moved by a spontaneous disgust for their inhuman conclusions, the tide of thought started once more in the opposite direction. Mr. Huxley continues:

> Of late years, a new tendency has become apparent. It may be that this is due mainly to the mere increase of knowledge and the extension of scientific analysis. It may be that it has been determined by social and psychological causes. Disillusionment with *laisser faire* in the human economic sphere may well have spread to the planetary

system of *laisser faire* that we call natural selection. With the crash of old religious, ethical, and political systems, man's desperate need for some scheme of values and ideals may have prompted a more critical re-examination of his biological position. Whether this be so is a point that I must leave to the social historians. The fact remains that the pendulum is again on the swing, the man-animal gap is again broadening.[5]

Huxley suspects the social origins of this new humanism, and if the history of thought is any guide in assigning its causes, his surmise is correct. Materialism was born of humanist reaction to religious dogma, and we are now witnessing the rebirth of humanist idealism in reaction to materialistic dogma. There is, however, sound scientific fact on which the new humanism may be based. The late Henry Fairfield Osborn, a leader among anthropologists, was the first orthodox scientist to call for radical revision of theories relating to the origin of man. In a series of lectures delivered in 1926-7, he assembled evidences, gathered since Darwin's time, which, he asserted, "compel us to separate the entire ape stock very widely from the human stock." Some extracts from one of these lectures will indicate the foundations of the anthropology of the future:

I am inclined to advocate an independent line of Dawn Man ancestors, springing from an Oligocene neutral stock, which also gave rise independently to the anthropoid apes. . . .

The prologue and the opening cast of the human drama occurred way back 16,000,000 years ago in the Upper Oligocene Period. . . . I regard the ape-human theory as totally false and misleading. It should be banished from our speculations and from our literature not on sentimental grounds but on purely scientific grounds and we should now resolutely set our faces toward the discovery of our actual pro-human ancestors. In my opinion, the most likely part of the world in which to discover these "Dawn Men," as we may now call them, is the high plateau region of Asia. . . .

In abandoning the Haeckel ape theory which revealed its apogee in the fantastic speculation of Klaatsch that different races of anthropoid apes gave rise directly to different races of men, we now give an entirely new frame to the human prototype to separate it sharply from the anthropoid type. . . .

The most welcome gift from anthropology to humanity will be the banishment of the myth and bogie of ape-man ancestry and the substitution of a long line of ancestors of our own at the dividing point which separates the terrestrial from the arboreal lines of primates.

---

[5] *Man Stands Alone* (New York, 1941), pp. 1-3.

> It is true that Darwin used the expression, "Man is derived from some member of the Simiidae," and that the term "ape-man" is deeply engraved in our consciousness, but I claim that it is misleading. . . . Between man and the ape—not only the hands and feet of the ape, but the ape as a whole, including its psychology—you will find more differences than resemblances. In brief, man has a bipedal, dexterous, wide-roaming psychology; the ape has a quadrupedal, brachiating, tree-living psychology.[6]

The arguments and evidence presented by Dr. Osborn, drawn from many fields of research, are literally unanswerable. Much of this lecture is devoted to showing the irreconcilable differences of mental habits and psychological traits between man and ape. Yet the tremendous importance of his contentions remains hidden from the general public, and it is certain that college students, except for those specializing in anthropology, pass their four years of "higher learning" blissfully ignorant of the fact that the foundations of Darwinism have been blasted away. The closest approach to an honest statement of the present situation in anthropology appeared recently in a *Scientific American* editorial, where the writer points out that the conflict which once raged between the evolutionists and the Christian fundamentalists is today "practically dead."

> Science hasn't won [admits the editorial writer], since science doesn't yet understand the method of evolution. The other side hasn't won either, though at their behest the word evolution is omitted from most textbooks for the young. Yet today nobody wants to argue. One can't even pick a good fight about it.[7]

"Herculean efforts," H. P. Blavatsky predicted, will be necessary to bring about the rejection of the theory that man is descended from a ferocious and brutal ape. The silence which has followed Dr. Osborn's attack on popular Darwinism is evidence that this effort has hardly begun. While fewer and fewer attempts are being made to prove the ape-origin theory, it now has the force of a sanctified scientific tradition, unconsciously assumed by all men who place any faith at all in the general body of scientific knowledge. Soon it may be realized that the only way of displacing this dogma is through affirmation of a strikingly different interpretation of man's ancestry, with emphasis on the fact that nothing less than a truly spiritual teaching of the nature of man, his origin and destiny, can meet the moral crisis of our civilization. This was the solution offered to the world by H. P. Blavatsky, without alternative and without compromise.

---

[6] *Science*, May 20, 1927.

[7] *Scientific American*, October.

REGULARITY, PERSEVERANCE, IMMORTALITY

THESE three are words used to indicate different phases, or degrees, of one and the same thing. That which men call immortality on higher planes has its counterpart on the lower in constancy, regularity, perseverance. All spiritual truths have their counterparts in daily life and it is through these that the higher laws may be known. Immortality is an unbroken conscious existence in spirit, in which the soul realizes its own deathlessness.

Few men have the faintest idea of what immortality really means. For most, it is a wholly passive condition from which all sense of duty and responsibility has fled. By some, it is pictured as the eternal rest of Christian heaven, where one *sits* forever on the right hand of his Father; by others, a fool's paradise erected upon present ideas of personal ease and comfort. Almost universal is the belief that it means *escape* from work, duty, responsibility. Some have been known to long for immortality—who, under present conditions, have to seek ways and means to "kill time." If unable to occupy ourselves and find contentment in the hours presently at our disposal, how miserable would we be with the whole of eternity on our hands!

Immortality is not a passive condition of rest and inactivity. It is rest, indeed, but *active* rest—a rest that comes from harmonious work with nature, from freeing one's self of the strain and friction of personal ambition. It is a condition of mind wherein one carries through from birth to death and to birth again a conscious perception of his eternal spiritual nature. This is the end and aim of human evolution.

But how is such end to be achieved? Does one need but die to be ushered into final knowledge? Is it enough to *believe* in the dogmas of one's church to have conferred upon him the highest prize that nature holds? All experience shows that the process of life is an ever-becoming. Everything that exists has *become* what it is by virtue of growth, unfoldment, evolution. There is no miracle. No fruit could be but for the seeds that went before. Every high attainment has its beginning in the small accomplishments of daily life.

Do we find the duties of life to be stern and heavy? We must know it is not duty or fulfillment of duty that weighs upon us. The burden we feel is that of our own selfishness. It is ambition, anger, pride, and fear, and no rest is possible so long as these find homing in the

human heart. The wheel of life rolls ceaselessly on—there is no escape. But man's is the choice to place his consciousness either in the unmoved, yet ever-potent, centre, 'round which the wheel revolves —the Divine Self—or on the rim of personal existence, with its constant "ups and downs" of joy and sorrow. Visualize the chariot with axle and hub placed near the tire instead of center of the wheel. With every turn, the entire vehicle goes up and down from top to bottom. Even the smoothest road seems long and rough and rocky. Is the road we travel really a rough road, or might it be that we ourselves are off-center, that our consciousness is seated too near the rim of the wheel of life?

Comprehension of the meaning of immortal life demands that one possess some knowledge of the true nature of man. When we aspire to life eternal, what is it that we really seek? Can it be that we wish to prolong forever the physical body in its present state of imperfection and disease? All experience shows that this is not possible; that the body, like all forms, must soon return to the reservoir of nature. Is it intellect and mind, with its petty schemes and changing ideas, we hope to preserve? This we cannot do even for a day, so flighty and inconstant is the nature of mind. Then what is it we wish to immortalize? Is it the whole personality, made up of body, desires, feelings, ambitions, fears, ideas, motives? Would we be willing to live with these forever, at our present level of attainment, while infinite possibilities of improvement lie before us in every direction?

Consider that there is, in the universe, *one* basic substance, which is self-existent. It never came into being and will never go out of being. It is not substance in the sense that we think of substance, for it is the source as well of what we call consciousness, intelligence, feeling, mind, as of all forms of matter. It is called Spirit, or God, for lack of better words. All human beings with their variations of character, intelligence and disposition; with their bodily attributes of beauty, grace and charm, or lack of these; all animal creatures in infinite variety of species, together with trees, plants and minerals —all are but *modifications* in the one substance—Spirit. The substance alone is eternal. There is no immortality for forms, for modifications, for anything that is partial. Immortality pertains not to parts, but to the whole. Just as the matter of which all forms are made is indestructible, though forms must die, so also in the higher sense. Spirit, Consciousness, Life, alone—that which we *eternally* are—is immortal; not the changing attributes and forms we think ourselves to be.

All beings in essence are Spirit. The first law of life is Universal Brotherhood. Hence, the road to everlasting life begins, for the individual, with constancy, regularity and perseverance in the fulfillment of that Law. Would we measure our progress or know the fitness of ourselves to live, unchanging, deathless, in the realm of pure spirit? Then study the deeds of daily life. Analyze ourselves and our store of spiritual growth in terms of constancy and devotion to the good of all. Are we regular and constant in performance of little duties that demand our daily attention? Are we firm and persevering in the carrying out of high resolves made in moments of inspiration? Can we carry through for a single day the realization that we *are* souls, with action based on the position assumed? Man is not judged in the higher sense by occasional spurts of intense work and devotion, nor by his ability to perform spectacular and phenomenal deeds. In the eyes of law, real spiritual development is to be found in one's power of constancy, in his ability to be regular in whatever he does, in perseverance of devotion to his highest ideal. These are the seeds from which sprout and grow the holy flower of conscious immortality.

Immortal life is the symbol of eternal youth, unfading strength, perpetual work. Not desire for escape, but to be of greater service, not to shun responsibility, but to take upon one's self an increasing portion of the Karma of the world, is the motive that leads thereto. "Then do you enter into a partnership of joy, which brings indeed terrible toil and profound sadness, but also a great and ever-increasing delight."

The Great Immortals who have reached the goal do not forsake the field of human life. Whether in a body or out, Their toil is greater than ever before. Even as the axle bears both wheel and chariot along its course, so rests upon Them the burden of the universal wheel of life. They live in spirit, but work in matter, exemplifying in Their lives spiritual laws and principles which have their roots in the heart of the universe, in the imperishable nature of every man.

In the Founders of the Theosophical Movement do we find such Exemplars of Eternal Life—in Their work, the plan by which all men may reach to Their estate. Why have a plan, do we ask? Why the need of philosophy with its stern demand for constant study and work? Let us ask in return: Can there be regularity in life without a plan to guide our acts? Can there be constancy in devotion without laws and principles as a basis for conduct? Can we practice perseverance unless given an ideal towards which to aspire? The Great Ones come that all may live, that all may find in their own hearts that steady spot where burns the lamp of everlasting life.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

Wandering in the Boundary

> Science, dimly perceiving the truth, may find Bacteria and other infinitesimals in the human body, and see in them but occasional abnormal visitors to which diseases are attributed. Occultism—which discerns a life in every atom and molecule . . . affirms that our whole body is built of such lives, the smallest bacteria under the microscope being to them in comparative size like an elephant to the tiniest infusoria. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 225.)

A RECENT authority says: "Because they bridge the gap between the dead simpler protein molecules and the unquestionably living smaller bacteria, the viruses are irresistibly attractive to all who are interested in attaching precise meaning to the term 'alive'." [1]

Precise meaning to the term "alive!"

How far has modern investigation brought that precision into sight? Let us examine.

The studies of plant disease which led to the concept of "viruses" began with Mayer in 1882.[2] He thought that tobacco mosaic was caused by some orthodox form of bacteria. The extreme minuteness of the causative agent was first suspected by Iwanowski in 1892, who found that it would pass through a filter. This, *nota bene,* was four years *after* the publication of *The Secret Doctrine.*

His idea was that the agent was different in size, but not in kind, from the familiar bacterial forms. It is of deep significance, in relation to the cyclic tides of scientific discovery, that the first questioning of the bacterial theory in this connection came almost at the same time as the culmination of the discoveries of Roentgen and Becquerel, which, agreeably to another famous *Secret Doctrine* prophecy (Vol. I, 611-12), opened a vast new vista to science in general. The revelation that the atom is *not* the ultimate unit of matter came in 1897, only a year before the bacterium was found not to be the minutest form of life.

Beijerinck, in 1898, after checking Iwanowski's work, decided that the filter-passing fluid did not contain bacteria, but a parasitic "contagium vivum fluidum" living in the cells of the plant. In the orthodox manner, Iwanowski and Beijerinck bickered over the matter for some time, both probably dying convinced of the righteousness of their respective theories.

---

[1] *Science,* July 30, 1937.

[2] *Scientific Monthly,* April, 1939.

In 1925, after saying that "from this brief consideration of the hypotheses it is seen that we do not yet possess a better one than that which assumes a living fluid contagium," Kunkel pointed out that the non-penetration of virus into solid agar indicated it to be corpuscular. He confessed ignorance of the nature of the corpuscles, but thought they were of the nature of living cells. The theory that the mysterious agent was an enzyme (catalytic product of living cells used by them to modify their environment) then became generally accepted.

Confusion was introduced into the investigation by the discovery that the diseases in question were accompanied by the presence of protozoan bodies in the tissues of the plants, and that such bodies were known to be the cause of many animal and human diseases. No evidence yet exists that these bodies cause the plant diseases, but their presence is now considered evidence of the existence of virus. Apparently the first use of the word "virus," originally meaning "poison," was by Baur in 1906.

Baur thought it to be a product of the metabolism (digestive, transformatory, and excretive processes) of the plant. From then on, there was considerable confusion as to the possible nature of the material, some regarding it as living, some as purely chemical.

With the studies of Vinson and Petri, 1927-34, the chemical, non-living theory started to gain ascendancy. This theory was strengthened by the discovery of crystalline substances which produced the diseases—and of course, crystals were associated in the scientific mind with strictly non-living substances! The status of this theory may be summed up in the words of Stanley:

> The possibility that the activity may be due to an impurity must always remain, regardless of the material under discussion. However, since there is no reason to believe that such a situation actually prevails in the case of the virus protein, we are unable at the present time, to conclude other than that the high molecular weight protein under discussion is the virus. Now these same tests that indicate that the virus protein is homogeneous may be used to demonstrate that it possesses the ordinary properties of molecules. As a matter of fact, the chemist, after a perusal of the physical and chemical properties of the tobacco mosaic virus protein, has no difficulty whatsoever in coming to the conclusion that despite its huge size, it has all the properties of a molecule and hence is a molecule.[3]

But the most recent and far-reaching speculation began when Bawden and Pirie, in 1937, isolated proteins from the mosaic struc-

---

[3] *Scientific Monthly*, April, 1939.

tures which were very similar to those of the nuclei of germ-cells. In other words, suspicion arose as to the kinship between viruses and the genes, the basis of reproduction in living beings. Viruses are able to mutate. This was another evidence. They also increase in quantity during their sojourn in a living body, and reproduce themselves exactly. Green and Gortner thought that a virus might be a reproductive organism which had lost its power to produce protoplasm but had survived as a parasite; in other words, a degenerated gene.

> Kostoff (1936) made a very interesting comparison of a virus and a gene and concluded by saying:
>
> Some of them coincide, others are similar and some others different. It is very unfortunate that we do not yet know such essential characters according to which we can definitely establish the degree of relationship between genes and viruses. Until that time we have no right to claim that genes are identical with viruses. It is better now to leave this question open, instead of drawing conclusions. We can only say that in many respects the effect of the virus is similar to that of the gene.
>
> McKinney (1938) said:
>
> It is possible that the virus represents a filterable form of some larger organism, or it may represent a degenerated organism which has retrograded by a series of mutations to a stage where a few genes or perhaps a single gene remains to perpetuate as virus.[4]

Riddle thinks that the gene is a single protein molecule. Now this throws a very brilliant light on two problems of vital interest to Theosophists. First of all, *The Secret Doctrine* teaches that man fell heir to his diseases through cross-breeding, in the early days of fluidity of types, with species allied in form but dissimilar in astral and Karmic constitution. There is no evidence against the possibility, from the most scientific standpoint, that the reproductive particles in such miscegenations might undergo a whole series of anomalous and monstrous procreations with and within the animal cells, giving rise to the viruses as now known and also to various germs which in turn would undergo innumerable mutations.

Second, it is another powerful point of evidence that modern immunological methods are mere repetitions under another guise of the "sin of the mindless," involving new dangers to the physical (and moral) future of the individual as well as to his descendants. For this we have from time to time already reported much evidence.

It would be particularly agreeable to the scientific mind to be able to consider the virus as a purely chemical substance which could be so handled. According to Dr. Ralph Wyckoff:

---

[4] *Ibid.*

> A new field of research into the mechanism and control of disease is opened up by the possibility of treating its cause as a pure chemical compound. Stanley has found that the virus activity of the tobacco mosaic protein can be destroyed by several simple chemicals without alteration of its immunological specificity. Beard and I have shown that under certain conditions the papilloma protein loses all activity without measurable molecular change. It is not unreasonable to hope that experiments of this type will some day indicate a new way in which the body can be aided in protecting itself against disease.

In supporting this thesis, Wyckoff tries to imagine a purely "chemical" method of virus reproduction:

> As long as the smaller viruses were pictured as autonomous living agents preying on their hosts, their multiplication could be thought of as the consequence of processes resembling bacterial division. Viruses that are definite chemical molecules can be imagined not as such extraneous predatory organisms but as products of abnormal metabolic processes within the "infected" cells. We still know far too little about the details of protein chemistry to be able to understand how the introduction of a heavy virus molecule into a living cell induces its protoplasm to break down according to the new pattern established by this molecule, but the idea is not incompatible with what has already been learned about enzymal action.[5]

Prof. Soule stated that these viruses are generally accepted as living entities.[6] As though the situation were not already sufficiently confused, the researches of Prof. Richard Goldschmidt, formerly of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, have gone far to upset the gene theory as formerly held, indicating that heredity is the interaction of factors which cannot be traced to so simple an explanation as the combination and recombination of genes.[7] Dr. Ethel Browne Harvey, Department of Biology of Princeton University, has succeeded in securing early embryonic forms of life from fragments of eggs without nuclear substance, *i. e.*, without genes.[8] To which perhaps the only adequate reply would be that women should be kept in their place and out of biological laboratories! For this is coming very close to the "homunculi" of Paracelsus, and presaging the creation of parentless "life" long predicted Theosophically.

Now, all these investigations have been of the nature of extending our knowledge of the "living" toward the border of the "non-living"; but very recently the approach has been made from the other direction, that of tracing the traits of the "non-living" up into the "living."

---

[5] *Science,* July 30, 1937. [6] *Science,* July 29, 1938. [7] New York *Times,* Dec. 5, 1937.
[8] New York *Times,* Nov. 27, 1937; *Science News Letter,* Oct. 12, 1935.

Dr. Geo. A. Baitsell, of Yale University, who carried out extensive X-ray studies, claims that living matter was found to be *crystalline.* When the cell loses the ability to break down and reform the crystals in continuous sequence, death ensues:

> To Dr. Baitsell the evidence points conclusively to a principle of uniformity in all nature, which has hitherto been lacking. The biologist has regarded the world of life as being unique in its structural characteristics, but the x-ray shows crystals in everything and basic uniformity everywhere.[9]

W. D. Francis said nearly the same thing later.[10] He pointed out evidence, from the geometric outline of cells and the refraction of cell walls, that cellular material is crystalline; furthermore, he stated that the iron bacterium is a crystalline form of life.

Now all this overlaps the basic Theosophical doctrines, for in Theosophy there can be no unit so small as to be deprived of *life,* and the organized forms of life are due to the subconscious geometric ratiocination of the "builders" as much as are the mineral crystal formations.

Scientifically, the discovery of self-reproducing molecules has driven the line of the "organic" down into the "non-living" region; the discovery of the crystalline nature of life has driven the "inorganic" up into the region of the "living." Now what?

There are scientists wandering now in every part of this shadowy borderline, but they are of two schools; the one to which all this is a triumph of materialism, claiming that all "life" is merely the combinations of the "non-living"; the other, smaller, but growing rapidly, is moving toward a rejection of *any* borderline. And thus toward Theosophy.

> Esoteric philosophy teaches that everything lives and is conscious, but not that all life and consciousness are similar to those of human or even animal beings. . . . The idea of universal life is one of those ancient conceptions which are returning to the human mind in this century, as a consequence of its liberation from anthropomorphic theology. . . . It hardly seems possible that science can disguise from itself much longer . . . that things that have life are living things, whether they be atoms or planets (*S. D.* I, 49).

Inexorable logic is with the universalist school. The proposition is just as simple as this: if all life is a manifestation of non-conscious matter, then the existence of any consciousness at all must be denied. (The materialist avoids this conclusion only by refusing to let the discussion be carried that far.) If, on the other hand, consciousness

---

[9] *Science,* Aug. 13, 1937.

[10] *Science,* Jan. 7, 1938.

is latent in everything (and how could consciousness arise in the "living" unless it is latent in the "non-living" of which it is composed?), then everything lives. For the very essence of "life" is consciousness of some degree.

In the end, Universal Life will have to be admitted. The lines of investigation described will lead to finer and finer subdivisions of molecular matter, with the "line" still receding, until the atom itself is reached; continued "splitting of the atom"—metaphysically as well as physically—will lead science into the bosom of unorganized Space itself for its answer. And then, at last, it may begin to be suspected that the source of "life" can never be found until the investigator learns to look within "with reverted sight." For he is himself the "source" of all the "life" he sees, which is a mere reflection from within upon an endless series of forms generated by his own creative imaginings. The unconscious manufacture of elusive appearances will go on just as long as their pursuit continues.

Some Questions

1. The theory of previous and after-births being established, how are we to view the mountains and stones, etc., as a birth (if at all), and if so how is their redemption to be effected? When I ask you to view the stones, as a state of birth, the question may perhaps seem a little ridiculous, but I have seen *stanzas* in the works of Sages of the south, saying that it is possible for man so to degenerate himself as to be born in his next life, as a beast, a tree, a stone, etc.

2. Could *Mahatmas* speak any language that they please?

Answers

1. If a personality becomes so depraved, that its higher principles desert it entirely, that personality will disintegrate and be re-absorbed into the cosmos, when it will have to begin its round again as an elemental force in a stone, tree or animal, etc. This is what is meant by being born in the next life as a beast. The human monad *as such* does not become a beast.

2. Yes, by putting themselves *en rapport* with the 5th principle of a man, who speaks that language, or by other means well known to eastern adepts.

—*Theosophist.*

THE BUILDING OF THE WALL

. . . and before yours of today, I fell to thinking about you and wondering whether a future of power, a brilliancy of knowledge, was not your aspiration, and what effect certain occurrences would have upon that. —*Letters That Have Helped Me.*

NOT long ago, a popular writer on scientific subjects remarked that, so far as personal happiness is concerned, intelligence is not a benefit but a curse. The masses, he said, have a deep distrust of superior intelligence; so much so that a man possessing it, and desiring political power, is often under the necessity of concealing his better judgment.

To take a road still higher than that of mere intelligence, the way of spiritual wisdom, is indeed to set forth into a howling desert of loneliness.

H. G. Wells, in his early days, wrote things of power; not least was *The Country of the Blind.* In this story, a man tumbled into a legendary lost valley, where all the inhabitants were blind. Remembering that "In the country of the blind, the one-eyed man is king," he saw bright visions of power for himself. Shortly indeed he found that in their own country and amid their familiar touch-marks, the blind were his masters. To them his descriptions of what he saw were the delirium of insanity, his eyes the abnormal excrescences which caused it. True, he could defend himself, strike and injure; thus was his superior power confined to destructiveness or non-use. Finally, to win a home and the companionship of a blind woman whom he loved, he consented to an operation to cure his ailment; for, said they all, he was really a good fellow and could be a useful citizen once his eyes were removed. At the last moment he chose the mountain-tops again; with cold and loneliness and death, but death in the sight of the stars.

The man who essays real knowledge learns the lesson of this tale from personal experience. So long as he remains silent, his only penalty is to be alone. But when he essays to teach, he finds that in the world his highest understandings are known as the eccentricities which mar the career of an otherwise fine man. That is at the best. At worst, there is dark speculation about the self-aggrandizement he must be planning under this mystification.

There will be those who come to listen. If his expression is able, they will employ their allotted time in admiring the cover of his book; if it is commonplace, they will not look inside for such poor material as must be under the drab binder.

His attempts to cause men to think for themselves will meet many discouragements; year after year, he will find the stone of ignorance that nearly broke his back to roll a mile uphill, returned within an inch of last season's resting place.

Again and again he will see those who traveled with him, and whom he had almost accepted as true fellows, tolled off into futility by the cracked tune and motley rags of some mad piper; at times he will see those whom he would help, seized by a panic of fear or greed, rush into the maelstrom they most dread, cursing him as a fool and criminal for pointing out the isle of safety.

If strong, he will spend much of his time in separation from his own kind, among the weak and dark of soul, that they may have more light.

Toward the end of his work, he may dimly see advancing a thin line of aspirants, the generation that will begin to speak his language long after his lips are silent; and if so many as half a dozen break the mists of futurity betimes, to clasp his hand in this flesh, he will be well content. For thus the "Guardian Wall" is built.

"What Can I Do?"

Question: "I am very much interested in Theosophy and should like to help the Society. What work can I do?"

W. Q. J.—This is a Theosophical business question. Service is rendered in many different ways: by work in the Branches, by spreading literature, by explaining the doctrines and doing away with misconceptions, by contributing money to be used in the work, by constituting oneself a loyal unit if ability and time be lacking; and chiefly always by acquiring a knowledge of Theosophical doctrines so as to be able to give a clear answer to inquiry. One could also procure some inquiring correspondent and by means of letters answer questions as to Theosophical literature and doctrines. These are all general answers, while the question requires almost a personal examination. Any work that is sincerely done in the Society with good motive and to the best of one's ability is good Theosophical work.

—*Vahan,* Aug. 1, 1891.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

HERE'S a problem I would like to see us work over, since it's time for our social problems discussion," said King. "I suppose a lot of it hinges on definitions of practicality. In discussions with several of my fraternity brothers I have argued that Theosophy is practical because it helps us to find out the things we are most anxious to know—like what the purpose of life is, and what are the possibilities of immortality. But I have discovered that the 'mass mind' considers as useful only those things that can be integrated with the economic struggle, and expresses a very positive conclusion that the acceptance of any moral philosophy is the quickest way to get yourself 'stood on your head' by the business world. So I'd like to figure out the way, if any, in which Theosophical principles can be applied in economic life without ultimately reducing us to the WPA. The argument is that if you have anything and are unselfish, you will be taken advantage of, and also, that if you are unselfish you won't get anything in the first place."

"But that isn't so," said Janice. "Because, to carry on from our discussion of last week, in nearly every man there is an element which makes him respect fairness and unselfishness, and so it would make him happier to do business with someone who has those qualities."

"Sure," said Dave, "even those who are dishonest would rather deal with an honest man who doesn't indulge in sharp practices, so they won't have to worry about their investments. A man with a lot of integrity of character is far more apt to become the president of a corporation than one whose past is even just a little bit shady."

"We all agree on those things," said Alayne. "I'd like to suggest another way of getting at the problem, though. Why not try to figure out just what rules and principles a Theosophist should follow in trying to earn money, and the ways in which these principles make things easier or harder?"

"Well, here's the first one," said King. "Going back to the fundamentals of brotherhood and the purpose of life, I would say that someone who lived Theosophic ideals would be primarily interested in giving service rather than in making money. If he was a candy manufacturer, for instance, he would use those ingredients that were least harmful to the human organism; if he was a doctor in charge of a clinic, he would try to see that the patients got what they needed, even when they couldn't pay for it; and if he was a lawyer, he would

be working for justice to *all* concerned. In other words, the service each could render would come first, and what he got from it, personally, would be 'leaving results to the law,' as Janice says."

"Sometimes you get in a position that makes things difficult," said Martinez. " Once I had a job getting boys to sell magazines. Sometimes these boys would work hard and still make no money because they couldn't sell them all. They had to pay for them before they sold, and we were supposed to tell them they could sell more than they thought they could. I wouldn't do this, and the money coming in from my territory got smaller. The superintendent became angry at me when I refused to urge the boys to sell more than they thought they could. So I had no job. I was pretty young then, and all it did was disappoint me; but if I had a family and they needed the money, it would not be so easy."

"There is a very practical moral problem," Gail nodded. "Would it be better to follow the policies you didn't approve of, or let your parents or family starve to death?"

"Well, Max," said King, "why don't you say something? We always have to drag it out of you."

"I think maybe I would save some money before I had a family," said Max, "so if I stopped work, there would be time to look yet for another job."

"Well," said Dave, "now everything's all set for me to bring up a little pamphlet called *The Economic Basis of Idealism,* by Arthur E. Morgan. He says the first thing to do is to decide whether you really mean the idealism you talk about in business, and if you do, you won't go into any company that doesn't have honest policies, even if you could get more money there. He tells about one experience he had with an organization he instinctively distrusted. He saw that sooner or later they might ask him to do something that he wouldn't think to be right, so he began to look around for other possibilities in order that his family wouldn't suffer when he quit. It happened just like that, too, and because he was thinking in that idealistic, though practical, way all through his life, is probably why everybody respects him so much now. Mr. Morgan doesn't make any pretense of being holy, but he sure has lived a Theosophic life and has about the same answer to practical problems as we do."

Janice frowned slightly: "But men like that can only do a little good. If they studied Theosophy they could spread a philosophy that would make many others *want* to live lives of service, because they see the *reason* for it."

"Well, what is Theosophy, anyway?" asked Gail. "I mean, it's a way of living, isn't it? You can only *prove* you are a Theosophist by the way you live. Aren't Theosophical ideals spread all the time by example? Something may strike fire in a man who admires another's life of service, and he may look for a rational explanation and philosophy *afterwards,* instead of before. Finally, there must come both a Theosophic philosophy and a Theosophic life; but if someone helps start you out after either one, you'll probably catch up with both of them before you finish. I think someone like Mr. Morgan may be doing a lot of inspiring by example and *preparing* the susceptibility of others to Theosophy, even though neither he nor they know it."

King looked appreciatively at Gail. "It's funny how what someone else says can bring a whole development of ideas into your mind like a flash. While Gail was talking, suddenly I thought of a very interesting discussion I had just a little while ago with one of my professors. He is sympathetic to Theosophy and quite a student of the history of Theosophical ideas. His description of the Theosophical Movement was both provocative and encouraging to me. He had no doubt about the fact that Theosophical ideas are as old as thinking man, and that they had been promulgated among the elect few in ancient times by the mystery religions and philosophical schools. Paralleling the direct teaching of ideas, he said, there was to be discerned also a current of more indirect influence. Western speculative philosophers and mystics, such as Bruno, Lessing and Schopenhauer, approached closely the teachings in some of their important phases, and, together with all the movements of thought that tended away from a personal God and towards pantheism, represented the diversified elements of the 'second line' of the same movement. Doesn't this suggest that the Theosophical Movement in its broadest sense can be thought of as existing on many different levels at the same time, and that these lines are moving towards a final integration and synthesis?

"The professor also pointed out that Madame Blavatsky attempted just such an integration and made it possible for many of those who in other lives had been 'indirect disciples' of the teachings to become intimately associated in her time with Theosophy in its entirety. Today there must be many lines of thought in parallel development, awaiting fusion with the central teachings, even though their leaders are for the most part entirely unaware of this. Therefore, I would guess that the many excellent men who have dedicated their lives to the service of humanity in science, social and political reform and education, are a part of this larger movement. Mr. Morgan is a

very good example to illustrate the point. As Gail pointed out, he is constantly awakening among receptive individuals a real social consciousness, which is a necessary work of preparation. Of course, he is not the only one; perhaps here in California another good representative would be someone like Carey McWilliams, who has done so much for migrant workers. In nearly every community there must be those who in lesser degree serve the same end. If this is true, and it seems to me that it is, it must be of great importance for the Theosophist to recognize and encourage these 'helping hands.' "

"I think you have a very useful analysis there," said Dave, enthusiastically.

"Something that always puzzles me," said Alayne, "is how there can be so many men of that type, working with a lot of devotion to better social conditions, when most of them think that heredity and environment explain all there is to human nature. Just how do they get that way? I know they must bring an intuitive knowledge over from another life, but why do they lose the rational basis for it? They must have had Theosophical philosophy at some time, too, to fit in with the way they learned to live."

"Maybe, with the world as it is today, they can do the most good indirectly and also keep their efforts concentrated in one direction by taking up a particular economic reform," offered Martinez.

"Maybe so," agreed Dave. "I suppose all of us have wondered about the men and women who talk as if they were complete materialists and yet live like saints. There's an article in the magazine, THEOSOPHY, which helps to explain this, called "Philosophy and Conduct." Perhaps you'd be interested to read it. It's in the issue for September, 1939."

As some of the group made the notation, Gail spoke up. "One large problem remains to be answered, though: how could we go about getting men like Mr. Morgan and Mr. McWilliams to consider Theosophy—as a specific teaching?"

"Maybe you just have to wait," ventured Max.

"I'm not so sure," said King, thoughtfully. "It seems to me that men like the ones we are talking about *prove* the worth of 'teaching by example' by the results they get. Theosophists are gradually getting results in the world of ideas, but there is no reason why they can't show "practical" results, also. Now Mr. Morgan is giving much of his energy to a project called "Community Service"—its aim to establish a beneficial and cooperative community life. Why shouldn't the U.L.T. 'communities' some day be able to demonstrate by their continued and mutually helpful existence that they possess an unshak-

able basis for united effort in the teachings of Theosophy, and that, therefore, because of the *results* accomplished, the philosophy should be given a respectful hearing?"

"I can see how that might work," said Max. "If every Theosophist lived like in a big family—worked together and shared everything, that would maybe prove—"

"I guess that's what King means," broke in Gail. "Why shouldn't Theosophists show results all up and down the line, from the world of ideas to the problems of establishing a basis for cooperative social life? The more Theosophists live lives of real social service, the more the respect of all sincere enquirers who have practical minds will be gained for the teaching. Then the day will come for integrating the indirect lines of the Theosophical Movement with its direct source."

"We have two minutes left," warned King. "Who will set up the problem for next week?"

"Let's go on from where we left off—" said Gail, "how to improve the social order. Many of our foremost intellectuals—in fact, just about our most vital writers—consider themselves to be socialists, and many other "liberals' are moving in the same direction. Socialists and 'conservatives' are constantly speaking such a different language that they almost hate each other. Can't we get behind the 'sound and fury' of opposing 'ideologies' to the real principles involved?"

"If there are no objections, the problem is set," ruled King, as the others began to drift toward the door.

BRIDGING THE GULF

On the brink of the dark chasm separating the spiritual from the physical world stands modern science, with eyes closed and head averted, pronouncing the gulf impassable and bottomless, though she holds in her hand a torch which she needs only to lower into the depths to show her mistake. But across this chasm, the patient student of Hermetic philosophy has constructed a bridge. It is these doctrines, which, studied analogically, and on the principle of correspondence, led the ancients, and may now lead the modern Philaletheian step by step towards the solution of the greatest mysteries.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

PROOFS OF THE HIDDEN SELF

Through Dreams

THE dream state is common to all people. Some persons say they never dream, but upon examination it will be found they have had one or two dreams and that they meant only to say their dreams were few. It is doubtful whether the person exists who never has had a dream. But it is said that dreams are not of importance; that they are due to blood pressure, or to indigestion, or to disease, or to various causes. They are supposed to be unimportant because, looking at them from the utilitarian view-point, no great use is seen to follow. Yet there are many who always make use of their dreams, and history, both secular and religious, is not without records of benefit, of warning, of instruction from the dream. The well-known case of Pharaoh's dream of lean and fat kine which enabled Joseph as interpreter to foresee and provide against a famine represents a class of dream not at all uncommon. But the utilitarian view is only one of many.

Dreams show conclusively that although the body and brain are asleep—for sleep begins primarily in the brain and is governed by it —there is still active a recollector and perceiver who watches the introspective experience of dreaming. Sorrow, joy, fear, anger, ambition, love, hate, and all possible emotions are felt and perceived in dreams. The utility of this on the waking plane has nothing to do with the fact of perception. Time all is measured therein, not according to solar division but in respect to the effect produced upon the dreamer. And as the counting of this time is done at a vastly quicker rate than is possible for the brain, it follows that some person is counting. In all these dreams there is a recollection of the events perceived, and the memory of it is carried into the waking state. Reason and all the powers of intelligent waking man are used in dreams; and as emotion, reasoning, perception, and memory are all found to be even more active in dreams than in waking life, it must follow that the Hidden Self is the one who has and does all this.

The fanciful portion of dreams does not invalidate the position. Fancy is not peculiar to dreaming; it is also present in waking consciousness. In many people fancy is quite as usual and vivid as with any dreamer. And we know that children have a strong development of fancy. Its presence in dream simply means that the thinker, being

---

Note.—This article was first printed in the *Path* for August, 1894.

liberated temporarily from the body and the set forms or grooves of the brain, expands that ordinary faculty. But passing beyond fancy we have the fact that dreams have prophecy of events not yet come. This could not be unless there exists the inner Hidden Self who sees plainly the future and the past in an ever present.

IN CLAIRVOYANCE

Waking clairvoyance cannot now be denied. Students of Theosophy know it to be a faculty of man, and in America its prevalence is such as to call for no great proof. There is the clairvoyance of events past, of those to come, and of those taking place.

To perceive events that have taken place in which the clairvoyant had no part nor was informed about, means that some other instrument than the brain is used. This must be the Hidden Self. Seeing and reporting events that subsequently transpire gives the same conclusion. If the brain is the mind, it must have had a part in a past event which it now reports, either as actor or as hearer from another who was present, but as in the cases cited it had no such connection as actor, then it follows that it has received the report from some other perceiver. This other one is the Hidden Self, because the true clairvoyant case excludes any report by an eye-witness.

Then again, when the clairvoyant is dealing with an event presently proceeding at a distance, it is necessary that a perceiver who recollects must be present in order to make report. For the brain and its organs of sight and hearing are too far off. But as the clairvoyant does report correctly what is going on, it is the other Hidden Self who sees the event, bridges the gap between it and the brain, and impresses the picture upon the bodily organs.

THE FEELING OF IDENTITY

If recollection is the basis for the feeling of identity continuous throughout life, and if brain is the only instrument for perception, then there is an inexplicable series of gaps to be accounted for or bridged over, but admitting the Hidden Self no gaps exist.

We are born feeling that we are ourself, without a name, but using a name for convenience later on. We reply to challenge by saying "It is I"—the name following only for convenience to the other person. This personal identity remains although we fall asleep each night and thus far become unconscious. And we know that even when a long period is blotted out of memory by fall, blow, or other accidental injury, the same feeling of identity crosses that gap and continues the

same identical "I" to where memory again acts. And although years of life with all their multiplicity of events and experience have passed, leaving but a small amount of recollection, we yet know ourselves as that unnamed person who came to life so many years before. We do not remember our birth nor our naming, and if we are but a bundle of material experience, a mere product of brain and recollection, then we should have no identity but constant confusion. The contrary being the case, and continuous personal identity being felt and perceived, the inevitable conclusion is that we are the Hidden Self and that Self is above and beyond both body and brain.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

A "MATERIAL" QUESTION

Question:—F. T. S. using tobacco defend the habit as having certain qualities very protective in studying Occultism. Is this true; and, if so, why is it incompatible with one of the five precepts taught by the Lord Buddha, viz.: "Shun drugs and drinks that work the wit abuse; Clear minds, clean bodies need no soma juice"? And is it not possible to educate the will, the spiritual will, to resist effectually everything which this deleterious weed tends to annul, if it does annul?

W. Q. J.:—I should like very much to know who is that F. T. S. who "defends the use of tobacco as a protective in studying Occultism," for he or she cannot know what protection means or Occultism either. The Editor of the FORUM has well answered the question, since the sentence I refer to, being only narrative, is not a question. Yet it is important as pointing to error of a vital sort. There are hundreds of Hindu occultists who never have indulged in tobacco; but they have not interdicted it to others. They protect themselves by means that can only be used in the plane where such protection is needful, and that is the plane where neither tobacco nor sentiment on that or any other subject has place. Tobacco may protect the carcass from germs of disease, but that security to safety is needed by all men, whether they are studying Occultism or not. The whole question of tobacco or no tobacco is purely material. It has been discovered that it does not degrade except by abuse, but at the same time it was found and declared that other narcotics and stimulants, such as hemp, opium, and spirits, do dynamically obstruct and spiritually degrade. Hence these tears—and tobacco.

—*Theosophical Forum,* October, 1890.

OBSERVATION, REASON, INTUITION

WE find ourselves living at a time when the word "faith" has fallen into disrepute. In fact, there are many who believe that one should not accept any principle whatsoever unless it is first "proved." But the word "believe" gives the secret away. It is of the very nature and constitution of man to have faith. When a man ceases to have faith, he loses the cohesive force that enables him to act as an independent, self-conscious agent; like a demagnetized compass needle, he swings uselessly, first in one direction, then in another. As we conceive of the real, so we behave. Vision and action go together. If we believe absurdities, we shall commit atrocities.

Blind faith, even though it may unite our energies for action, cannot be sanctioned; it nullifies the precious gifts of discrimination, choice, and individual responsibility, which are the priceless heritage of æons of effort and advancement. As no dogmatic authority can be relied upon, we must look to other foundations of belief: observation, reason, and intuition. Scientists rely upon observation coupled with reason; philosophers and religious leaders usually stress reason and intuition; mystics have always felt that intuition alone completely reveals the keys to this enigmatic world. But as there is no good reason for discarding any one of these grounds in preference for another, it would seem that a true belief should be individually substantiated by observation, reason and intuition.

Looking out upon the world, we are faced with a great multiplicity of variegated objects which at first glance seem wholly dissimilar. Upon closer inspection, however, certain correspondences can be discerned between the various members of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms. In fact, all matter is seen to be energy manifested in various forms, ultimately composed, according to scientific observation, of protons, electrons, and like units. An ascending scale of forms is evident, proceeding from the uniformity of matter in the basic elements to its most highly differentiated and specialized form—the human body. Thus, observation has revealed to us the evolution of matter.

Observation of a physical kind, however, serves only to break up the panorama of experience into an infinitude of units, clearly distinguishable, by either form, function, or position, one from another. Now what can be made of this heterogeneous collection of "individuals," and where is there any meaning in their eternal inter-

action, the seeming confusion of "natural" events? Reason demands the uniting of phenomena under some general conception or law. There is no understanding, no *science,* without universal principles, and observation supplies nothing but the particular. Is there a correspondence between this manifest need and the age-long effort of philosophy and religion to submerge the particular in the universal? The answer is not far to seek.

There can be no philosophy or religion of unique individuals or events. Separate units are "irrationals." Reason cannot deal with them, for each entity is just itself and a law to itself. Philosophy and religion cry out for a unity; the world, they insist, is One.

But belief in a world of evolving entities that have arisen through manifestation of the One, though satisfying observation and reason, is still incomplete. For intuition tells us that in addition there must be some purpose, some goal to the processes of the universe; that the cyclic unfolding of multiform potency from within the One is not accidental or capricious, but of the very nature of Reality. The path is not a continual upward grade, but a spiral ascent of involution and evolution.

On the grounds of observation, reason, and intuition, we have formed a principle which maintains the fundamental identity of all souls. Our intuition of justice and law asserts that our position along the ladder of evolution is a result of experiences and efforts at lower levels—experiences which can be accounted for only by the doctrine of cyclic reincarnation. Evolution of matter is seen to consist in proceeding from simple, undifferentiated stuff to complex, specialized forms. Evolution of soul, on the other hand, is the progressive identification of the soul with the One. The personal ego is the knot of our continual state of ignorance, and so long as we live in that ego we do not share in the delight of the universal spirit. In order to know the truth, we must cease to identify ourselves with the separate ego shut up within the walls of body, life, and mind. We must renounce the narrow horizon, the selfish interest, the unreal objective.

Deliverance from the illusion of separateness is not achieved by means of abstract knowledge. Intellectual progress helps us to clear the mental atmosphere of chimeras and phantoms, of errors and illusions. When these hindrances are removed, the truth of spirit is revealed, self-supported and without doubt. But an inward change alone fits souls for eternal life in its fullest sense. Our apprehension of reality must embrace the whole of our nature, thought, feeling, and will. Wherever this apprehension is only partial, there will be

discontent and unrest. The individual strives towards unity by throwing off all that is impure and selfish.

All this means effort. Wisdom is not cheaply won. It is achieved through hard sacrifice and discipline, through the endurance of conflict and pain. Wisdom flows from the perfection of human living, the fruit of ceaseless straining of the human soul to pierce through the crushing body, the distracting intellect, the selfish will, and to apprehend the unsheathed spirit. Wisdom is born in the man who tries to reach reality behind the restless stream of nature and his own feelings and desires. The destiny of the human soul is to realize its oneness with the Supreme.

"Whatever thou doest, O son of Kunti, whatever thou eatest, whatever mortification thou performest, commit each unto me. Thus thou shalt be delivered from the good and evil experiences which are the bonds of action; and the heart being joined to renunciation and to the practice of action, thou shalt come to me."

A FURTHER STEP

[Science] having found out and admitted that space and even time could be annihilated by physical apparatuses, we really do not see the great difficulty of taking a step further and admitting at least the possibility of psychological potencies in man; potencies capable of replacing successfully physical forces and using these but as a basis of, and a complement for, objective manifestations. The most serious impediment in the way of such recognition is the complete ignorance of physical science of all the potentialities contained in the astral light or akasa. She admits the existence of ether, hypothetical though it still remains for her, simply because were its actuality to be rejected, the theories of light, heat and so many other things would be nowhere, and that her most scientific expositions would be upset. Why not admit on the same principle the possibility of spectral apparitions, of the materializations of the spiritualists, of the *double* or the "döppelgangers" of living persons, etc., rather than encounter the tremendous difficulty of setting to naught the collective evidence of the ages, and that of 20 millions of modern spiritualists, all eye-witnesses to various phenomena who certify to their actuality?

—*The Theosophist,* June, 1883.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Trend in Western Psychology

First clear evidence of a link, long expected by theosophists, between the eastern and western brands of Hatha Yoga, appears with the April, 1941, *Journal of General Psychology,* in an article on Autohypnosis by Andrew Salter, of New York. Dr. Salter quotes *Yoga: A Scientific Evaluation,* by K. T. Behanan (See Theosophy XXVI, 43-6), in mentioning the possible identity of the autohypnotic state with the "samadhic (trance) state of yoga"! Later on he admits that the anaesthesias and catalepsies produced by self-hypnosis do not equal the *samadhic* trance. It is indeed wonderful to see these casual references to *Samadhi* in a modern journal of psychology. How eclectic, how broad and catholic are the views of the modern hypnotist! How modest the admission that his three "techniques" of autohypnosis, described by Dr. Salter in this article, will not bring on Samadhi! Theosophists had best steel themselves against such desecrating forms of psychological materialism, for this is but the raindrop that presages the monsoon of scientific psychism.

Some Wild Statements

Dr. Salter's account of the methods by which subjects can be taught to hypnotize themselves has been widely discussed in the scientific columns of the press, much being made of the supposed value of autohypnosis to persons who struggle against personal habits such as nail-biting, stuttering, smoking and over-eating. Typical of the ignorance which prevails in scientific circles on the subject of hypnotism are the comments of Waldemar Kaempffert, printed in the New York *Times* of June 8:

> It is popularly supposed that strong will can defy any hypnotist. Will has nothing whatever to do with hypnosis. But intelligence has. For that reason not every one can be hypnotized either by himself or by somebody else. Hence it is important to determine into how deep a trance you can go. When that is known it is easy to decide whether or not the suggestions that you give to yourself will do any good.
>
> From 20 to 25 per cent of all persons can go into the deepest trances and thus benefit themselves by self-suggestion. Another 10 per cent will have results which are not so good. The rest are simply out of the pale either because they cannot hypnotize themselves at all or because the trance is not deep enough.

HYPNOTISM AND CRIME

One would suppose the *Times* science editor knew all about "the will," and that psychology, for him, is a clear and open book, without mystery or problem. Just how scientific is the assertion that the will has "nothing to do with hypnosis," when even specialists in this field admit that "any understanding of hypnosis beyond the descriptive phase is purely speculative"? (*Medical Record,* Dec. 5, 1934.) Generally cautious in his pronouncements, Mr. Kaempffert is utterly without justification for this dogmatic opinion. Also, he must be familiar with the researches of Prof. Wells of Syracuse University, who has demonstrated the power of hypnotism to induce "innocent men and women to commit 'real crimes'." (See Lookout for October.) How, then, can Mr. Kaempffert urge that, despite the "decided limitations to hypnosis of any kind," "Salter's method clearly has a place in medical practice, as well as in self-training"? True, in defense of self-hypnosis, Dr. Salter writes as follows:

> In autohypnosis not only does the "subject" hypnotize himself, but he also has complete control of the trance state at all times. To use a word that should be obsolete, the only person with *rapport* is the subject, and that *rapport* with himself.

But Dr. Salter further says, describing one of his three techniques:

> I find out if the person who wishes to learn autohypnosis is a good hypnotic subject in the first place. . . . I tell the subject, *who is wide-awake,* and has previously been developed into as good a hypnotic subject as possible, that if he wishes, he can be taught to put himself into a trance wherein he can give himself suggestions exactly as I would give them, and with the same effect, if not better.

"CLASS" IN MEDIUMSHIP?

Now a "developed" hypnotic subject is a person trained in passivity, the *sine qua non* of mediumship. In fact, Dr. Salter asks, as a line of future investigation, "What connection, if any, is there between autohypnosis and progressive relaxation?" Other questions relate to the teaching of autohypnosis to large groups, with speculation as to the depth of the trance that might be induced in this way. On the terrible danger of this procedure, William Q. Judge wrote:

> When the hypnotic process—or subjugation, as I call it—is submitted to, a disjunction is made between the soul-man and the astral body, which then is for the time deprived of will, and is the sport of any suggestion coming in unopposed, and those may and do sometimes arise outside of the mind and intention of the operator. From this arises sensitiveness to suggestion.

This shows that while the immediate purpose of both operator and subject, or subject alone, as in autohypnosis, may be avowedly beneficial, the sensitivity which has been produced opens the subject to quite other suggestions. The more "developed" the subject, the more susceptible to suggestion. Further, the alleged value of autohypnosis depends upon its post-hypnotic effects. Says Dr. Salter:

> Autohypnosis completely surmounts . . . diminution of post-hypnotic suggestion. The subject administers the post-hypnotic suggestions to himself whenever he so desires. . . . The importance of autohypnosis lies in its ability to overcome the diminution of the effects of post-hypnotic suggestion. For example—one of my cases, a stutterer, treated heterohypnotically [by ordinary hypnotism, involving an operator], would speak impeccably for about two days, and then relapse to her old level. With autohypnosis she had no occasion to revisit me.

Scope of Hypnotic Influence

Mr. Judge continues, on the question of post-hypnotic suggestion:

> The idea, or thought, or picture of an act is impressed by suggesting it to the astral body, and then the patient is waked. At the appointed time given by the suggestor a secondary sleep or hypnotic state arises automatically, and then, the disjunction between soul and astral body coming about of itself, the act is performed. . . . [This] indicates that although the subject be dehypnotized the influence of the operator once thrown on the subject will remain until the day of the operator's death. . . .

While on rare occasions, the use of hypnotism may prove beneficial (in this case better called *mesmerism*—modern psychology is ignorant of the difference between these modes of suggestion), the failure of practitioners to understand what really takes place as the result of their operations makes the exercise of such semi-occult powers extremely hazardous. But the real danger, as Mr. Judge says, "is in the lack of morality and ethics in the use of them, both now and in the future." Further, "As the true evolution of man's inner powers and at the same rate and time concurrently with all other racial and planetary evolution is not admitted by these schools, they cannot perceive in the future any possibly devilish use of hypnotic powers." It is not simply the consequences to individuals he warns against, but the general social effects of the popular practice of hypnotic experiments:

> The view expressed by Charcot that a subject is liable to fall under the influence at the hands of anyone should be admitted, as also that in the wake of the hypnotizer will be found a host of hysteriacs, and

that it all should be regulated by laws is unquestionable. I go still farther and say that many persons are already in a half-hypnotized state, easily influenced by the unprincipled or the immoral; that the power to hypnotize and to be sensitive to it are both progressive states of our racial evolution; that it can and will be used for selfish, wicked, and degrading purposes unless the race, and especially the occidental portion of it, understands and practices true ethics based on the brotherhood of man. (THEOSOPHY XXV, 315-16.)

THEORIES OF PRIMITIVE RELIGION

Twentieth century studies of the primitive races of the world are leading to revolutionary changes in the theories of the origin and development of religion. For some fifty years, anthropological research in this field has been dominated by the theories of E. B. Tylor and Sir James Frazer. Tylor proposed that religious ideas have evolved through three phases: Animism, Polytheism, and Monotheism. Frazer held that the passage from Animism to Polytheism resulted from a desire for simplification and unification. He wrote:

After men had peopled with a multitude of indwelling spirits every rock and hill, every tree and flower, every brook and river [Animism] . . . they began, in virtue of what we may call the economy of thought, to limit the number of spiritual beings. . . . Instead of a separate spirit for every individual tree, they came to conceive of a god of the woods in general, a Silvanus or what not; instead of personifying all the winds as gods, they imagined a single god of the winds, an Aeolus. . . . The innumerable multitude of spirits or demons was generalized and reduced to a comparatively small number of deities; animism was replaced by polytheism.

"FALSE INFERENCE," "MISLEADING TRANSLATION"

The next step of "progress," Frazer maintained, was the further generalization of the many gods into one "solitarity deity"—monotheism. J. D. Unwin, in his *Sex and Culture,* published in 1934, offered the following objections to Frazer's ideas:

. . . if that theory were correct, it would appear that the natives would use one word for the spirits in trees, another for the spirits in winds, another for the spirit in rocks, etc.; but the fact is that they used the same word to denote the power, whether it was in a tree, in a rock, or in any other place. How, then, can a Silvanus be a generalization of tree-spirits, for the alleged spirits were never ubiquitous to trees and the natives did not distinguish between the power in a tree and the power in a rock. Is it not plain that Sir

James has based his suggestion first upon a false inference, and then upon a misleading translation? . . .

Gradually then, the fallacies are being exposed. . . . No tree or rock is revered *qua* tree or *qua* rock. It is regarded with veneration because the power in the universe is manifest there, the power being the same whether it be in a tree or a rock. This power is often conceived not as an entity but as a quality, the idea that it is a personified cause being due to what M. Swanton has called our "European lineage."

. . . with a natural and comprehensible egocentricity, we have tried to interpret the culture of simpler societies in such a manner that the result would reflect to our own glory and bear witness to the great difference between us and them. We have tried to prove the existence of an evolution from primeval man to twentieth century white man. We shall never succeed in understanding either ourselves or any other men if we study human affairs in so unscholarly a manner.

Beliefs Misrepresented

Animism is based on the supposition that the power or unique quality in some persons and certain objects, revered by primitive peoples, was and is regarded by them as an *entity*. Unwin says that this quality is untranslatable, and that attempts to render it into European tongues are "unacceptable and misleading," adding:

On these translations Sir E. B. Tylor founded his theory of animism. A knowledge of this theory on the part of observers and travellers has been responsible for many unsatisfactory descriptions of uncivilized culture, such descriptions being based on false inferences from the observed facts.

He asks:

When it is said that a native conception is that of a god, we do not know by what criterion it has been judged whether it is a god or not. Is it not plain that Mr. Fewkes was right when he said that "in the use of the words gods, deities, and worship we undoubtedly endow the subject with conceptions which do not exist in the native mind"?

Mistaken Interpretations

Recognition that this error colors almost all the source materials of cultural anthropology is bringing much more intelligent accounts of the customs and religious beliefs of peoples whose traditions differ from our own. A recent book on Mexico, *Enchanted Vagabonds,* by Dana Lamb (Harper, 1938), illustrates the modern understanding of non-Christian peoples, as the following passages reveal:

Authorities differ widely in their interpretations of the customs, religion, and traditions of Mexican tribes. This is partly because an

observer frequently translates Indian behavior into terms of his own social order or psychology. The early Spanish commentators tried to find parallels between sixteenth century European culture and the culture of the New World. They talked of "emperors" and "empires," and any one who knows Indians knows that such concepts are alien to them. Each tribe has his leader, but his office is not hereditary; he is elevated to his position by reason of his superior attributes and his ability to solve the group's problems. He leads the religious ceremonies and other communal activities, and though he is accorded respect by other members of the tribal unit, his word is far from law. . . . There is no place in the communal organization of an Indian village for the individualist. The survival of the group depends upon the harmonious working together of its members, upon a subordination of the parts to the whole. The result is an absence of friction, and freedom from the necessity of continually asserting one's self. The clash of personalities which seems inevitable to social intercourse among our people has no counterpart there. If, as occasionally happens, an Indian talks too much about himself, or boasts unduly, he is given a wide berth by the others (p. 210).

STORY OF QUETZALCOATL

The author's conversation with a descendant of the noble Zapotecs reveals the rare beauty and living power of the Mexican religion:

"Who taught you about the Great Power, Juan?"

"My father," he replied. "But my people first learnt of these things long ago when the Zapotecs were strong and powerful. A great teacher, whose bearded face was white, came to us from the East. This man taught us to do many things of which we knew nothing before his coming. He ruled over many tribes in turn and each of them called him by a different name. This man taught us to be unselfish, and to worship the Great Power; and while he ruled over us the tribe prospered. Then he departed in a little boat, but he promised that some day he would return to us. Long, long after he had gone, the Spaniards came. At first we thought that they, too, might be great and good teachers. We knew that this was not so when they tried to destroy all that he had taught. Our books, our temples, all these things perished. Then we were forced to build temples to their gods with the stones of our old altars. They rewarded our kindness with cruelty. Now we use their churches, pray before their altars, and listen to the words of their priests, but when we pray, we pray to our ancient god. Sometimes they know this, but what can they do?"

I could not help thinking as Juan told me in his version of the great mythological hero, Quetzalcoatl, who according to Indian tradi-

tion ruled over the Toltecs, Mayas, and Zapotecs in turn, of the painful contrasts between that "bearded man whose face was white," and the men who came after. Perhaps the great priest-king-teacher, whose memory is still venerated in a thousand little villages throughout Mexico, is only a folk myth, but I do not think so. . . .

The Greater "One"

"Do all your people worship the Great Power, Juan?" I questioned.

"No," he answered. "Some of the mountain people worship the sun because he gives light and heat, and makes the crops grow. And because there must be two of everything, they also worship the moon, his queen. But my own people realize that the sun, the moon, the earth, and the stars are ruled by a still greater One." . . . . He gazed at the twinkling point of light for a long time, as he tried to comprehend the distances of stellar space. Then he turned to me and said with glowing eyes, "Perhaps the Great Power will permit me to go there some day after I die and start life all over again."

Evil "Spirits" of the Punjab

Quite a different sort of recognition of the truth in ancient beliefs is presented by an article in the Manchester *Guardian* for July 30. The author, John Coatman, Chairman of Convocation at Manchester University, tells of an experience which he had on the Northwest Frontier of the Punjab, in India, while in the service of the British army. In this region, he relates, the word "pari" (probably a variant of the Persian *peri*) "has retained completely unimpaired all its original meaning of something evil and malevolent." Elsewhere, a "pari" is regarded as simply a fairy, in our meaning of the word. On this frontier the activities of the paris are made to explain various weird phenomena, including mysterious "stone-throwing" similar to that attributed to "spirits" by western spiritualists. Mr. Coatman reports:

A favorite spot for the practice by the fairies of this particular form of their war of nerves was Nishpa Fort, in the Western Sherani hills, a stronghold which we had built, very unwisely, on the site of a ruined Mohammedan shrine, itself the successor of a much older Hindu, or, probably, Buddhist shrine. Here men were actually struck by the stones—a thing which, strangely enough, very rarely happened in the open—and it was a standing order of the fort that men were never to be posted singly.

Another place of malignant influence is "a softly rounded knoll" not far from a mountain torrent which divides country of the Pathan Sheranis from the Usteranis, a small tribe living between the Pathans and the Baloch tribes. The slopes of the knoll are covered with grass, and its summit crowned with a clump of great plane trees. There is no explanation for this vegetation in the midst of the surrounding barren country. The reputation of the knoll is one of "unrelieved evil," and no man, not even a wild creature or bird, is ever seen there. Men who have approached all died of inexplicable injuries. Mr. Coatman tells of a Mohammedan doctor who was found dead with a broken neck not far from the knoll. The officer investigated:

> Against violent protest, I climbed to the summit. I left my men across the stream. It would have been unfair to take any of them with me. I reached to trees and stood just inside the outermost rim of their shade. In spite of the blazing heat of the hot-weather day outside, the air was chill—not cool. In the middle of the trees I saw some irregularities of the ground which might have marked the site of some long-vanished building or altar. I had meant to explore the summit of the knoll thoroughly, but, for some reason which to this day I cannot explain, I went no farther. Instead I went back to my men and marched away at once.

INVISIBLE GUARDIANS

The "paris" described by Mr. Coatman bear a close resemblance to the *Bahti* said by H. P. Blavatsky to protect the buried secrets of the Gobi desert from premature discovery:

> Around no other locality, not even Peru, hang so many traditions as around the Gobi Desert. In Independent Tartary this howling waste of shifting sand was once, if report speaks correctly, the seat of one of the richest empires the world ever saw. Beneath the surface are said to lie such wealth in gold, jewels, statuary, arms, utensils, and all that indicates civilization, luxury, and fine arts, as no existing capital of Christendom can show today. The Gobi sand moves regularly from east to west before terrific gales that blow continually. Occasionally some of the hidden treasures are uncovered, but not a native dare touch them, for the whole district is under the ban of a mighty spell. Death would be the penalty. Bahti—hideous, but faithful gnomes—guard the hidden treasures of this prehistoric people, awaiting the day when the revolution of cyclic periods shall again cause their story to be known for the instruction of mankind. . . . The time will come, sooner or later, when the dreadful sand of the desert will yield up its long-buried secrets, and then there will indeed be unlooked-for mortifications for our modern vanity. (*Isis Unveiled* I, 598-9.)

Mystery of the Gorilla

Mrs. Belle J. Benchley, Director of the Zoological Gardens of San Diego, Calif., in her recent book, *My Life in a Man-Made Jungle* (Little Brown, 1940), adds some intuitive observations to naturalist literature about the gorilla. It is perhaps fortunate that Mrs. Benchley lacks formal training as a zoologist, enabling her to study the life and habits of the animals under her care with eyes unprejudiced by conventional scientific theory. In middle-life she accepted a job as bookkeeper at the zoo, nineteen months later being appointed its director, the post she now holds. Her description of the nature and peculiar traits of gorillas is the fruit of a sympathetic understanding joined with scientific curiosity. She says:

> There is something about gorillas which creates in everyone a strangely different feeling. This is not entirely their rarity, nor their near human appearance, but something inherent which grows gradually upon everyone until some of our most objective scientists have become almost as foolishly fond of them as I frankly am (p. 118).

"Not Man, Not Beast"

Other writers have experienced this "strangely different feeling." W. R. Leigh, who accompanied Carl Akeley on an African expedition, recorded his impression of the gorilla:

> The man-ape arouses in you a psychological reaction no other animal produces. You know he is not a man, yet you feel that he is not a beast in the same sense that other animals are. (*Frontiers of Enchantment,* 1938, p. 179.)

Ivan T. Sanderson, zoologist and explorer, in his book, *Animal Treasure,* relates that the Assumbo, a tribe of southeastern Nigeria, regard gorillas as "another race of man, and not animal at all." He adds: "I myself, as a zoologist, a naturalist, and an ordinary sane person, am in absolute agreement with the Assumbos." (See Theosophy XXVI, 325-6; XXVII, 424-5.) Mrs. Benchley continues:

> There is only one animal I have ever had look straight into my eye without flinching; that is the gorilla. Mbongo and Ngapi have beautiful eyes, large and dark-brown with long heavy and curled-up lashes, and often when I put my face down close to the wire of the cage one will put his face so that it touches the wire on the inside and study me, looking into my eyes with a steady questioning look as a person might. I wish I could interpret that expression, for it seems friendly, interested, yet it always withholds something I seek . . . the gorilla has the muscular machinery of words, it must be that he lacks that mental power which is the first necessity of the spoken word.

"SPEECHLESS MEN"

The light that Mrs. Benchley recognizes in the eyes of the gorilla is more than the gleam of elemental intelligence. The real anthropoids, writes H. P. Blavatsky, "have a spark of the purely human essence in them" (*S. D.* II, 193), and the secret withheld is that of the karmic tragedy of the "delayed race":

> It is most important to remember that the Egos of the apes are entities compelled by their Karma to incarnate in the animal forms, which resulted from the bestiality of the *latest* Third and earliest Fourth Race men. They are entities who had already reached the "human stage" before this Round. . . . The numberless traditions about Satyrs are no fables, but represent an extinct race of animal men. The animal "Eves" were their foremothers, and the human "Adams" their forefathers. . . . It is from this unnatural union that the present apes descended. The latter are truly "speechless men," and will become speaking animals (or men of a lower order) in the Fifth Round, while the adepts of a certain school hope that some of the Egos of the apes of a higher intelligence will reappear at the close of the Sixth Root-race. (*S. D.* II, 262.)

SOUND OF THE AURORA

The spectacular appearance of the Aurora Borealis is an unexplained mystery of light. *The Secret Doctrine* points out that the great magnetic tides at the poles, which cause the visible aurora, are "escape valves" for the energy transmitted from the sun to the earth. (For a full treatment of magnetic tides with *Secret Doctrine* references, see THEOSOPHY XVI, 59; XX, 210-11; XXI, 175.) According to H. P. B., "the phenomenon of polar lights is accompanied by, and productive of, strong sounds, like whistling, hissing, and cracking." (*S. D.* I, 205.) Since *The Secret Doctrine* was written, the usual scientific belief has been that sound does not accompany auroral displays. Yet from time to time people living in the far north tell of having heard just such a sound as H. P. B. describes. The peculiar fact is that the sound is heard *simultaneously* with the appearance of the beams of light. It would take several minutes for this sound to reach the point of observation on the earth, if it had to travel from where the light displays originate; consequently, the atmosphere near the earth must generate the sound at the same time that the light appears many miles above. Accumulated testimony to the fact of auroral sound has made this scientific enigma a source of controversy. The 1936 *Annual Report* of the Smithsonian Institution (p. 149) deals at length with the problem, but provides no clear explanation.

First-Hand Evidence

In *Science* for Sept. 8, 1933, Clark M. Garber offers his personal experience:

> The proposition of the audibility of the aurora borealis has been the subject of considerable speculation and much doubt. Some scientists have claimed with much positiveness that the aurora emits no audible sounds and that the beams of light or electrical waves, such as they may choose to call them, do not come close enough to the earth's surface to be audible, even if any sound were emitted. In my own mind there can be no doubt left as to the audibility of certain types of aurora, for I have heard them under conditions when no other sound could have been interpreted as such, for no other sounds were present.
>
> From the Eskimos I first learned that the aurora could be heard and, like most people, was rather skeptical about it, believing that their statements were based to a great extent on their superstitions. . .

Mr. Garber then describes one of the most wonderful displays he had ever seen:

> Great beams of light shot up from the northern horizon as if a battery of gigantic searchlights were searching the arctic landscape. In front of these beams and throughout the whole length of the northern horizon great waves of iridescent light traveled from west to east like gigantic draperies before the stage of nature's amphitheater. Great folds or waves, ever changing in color, traveled one after another across the horizon and from behind them streamed the powerful beams of white light.

"Cracking Sound"

> These beams of light could be seen passing directly over our heads, and when one chanced to come over the divide it appeared to be not more than a hundred feet above the surface. The spectacle was so awe-inspiring that the dog team was stopped and I sat upon the sled for more than an hour absorbing the marvelous beauty of this most unusual display. As we sat upon the sled and the great beams passed directly over our heads they emitted a distinctly audible sound which resembled the cracking sound produced by spraying fine jets of water on a very hot surface of metal. Each streamer or beam of light passed overhead with a rather accurate uniformity of duration. By count it was estimated to require six to eight seconds for a projected beam to pass, while the continuous beam would often emit the sound for a minute or more.

Further evidence of the sound of the aurora is given by David Evans, former school superintendent in Alaska. (Los Angeles *Times*, Aug. 14, 1938.) Prof. Carl Stormer, of the Norwegian Institute of

Theoretical Astrophysics, and his staff, testify to hearing the sound in Europe. (New York *Herald Tribune,* June 26, 1938.) While making no attempt to specify in terms of physical theory what may be the technical explanation of this audible sound caused by the Aurora, some suggestions, based on *Secret Doctrine* teaching, may be given. Years ago, H. P. B. wrote on the general subject of light, heat, sound, magnetism, and other physical phenomena, that their essential cause is a *substance.* This view, unacceptable to the science of that day, was explained as follows:

> In no way . . . do the Occultists dispute the explanations of Science, as affording a solution of the *immediate* objective agencies at work. Science only errs in believing that, because it has detected in vibratory waves the *proximate* cause of these phenomena, it has, therefore, revealed ALL that lies beyond the threshold of Sense. It merely traces the sequence of phenomena on a plane of effects, illusory projections from the region that Occultism has long since penetrated. And the latter maintains that those etheric tremors, are not, as asserted by Science, set up by the vibrations of the molecules of *known* bodies—the matter of our terrestrial objective consciousness, — but that we must seek for the ultimate causes of light, heat, etc., etc., in MATTER in *super-sensuous* states—states, however, as fully objective to the spiritual eye of man, as a horse or a tree is to the ordinary mortal. . . .

HIDDEN ESSENCE

> Occult teaching . . . maintains the reality of a supersubstantial and supersensible essence of that *Akasa* (not ether, which is only an aspect of the latter), the nature of which cannot be inferred from its remoter manifestations—*its merely phenomenal phalanx of effects*—on this terrene plane. (I, 514-15.)

The sole attribute of the Akasa, according to *The Secret Doctrine,* is Sound, and the law of occult correlation between sound and color (or light) is doubtless the key to the mystery of the audible sounds which accompany the flashing displays of the Aurora Borealis.